



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,305	10/10/2003	Tsukasa Ohnishi	1055/HIROSE	7315
27649	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER	
MICHAEL TOBIAS #40 1717 K ST. NW, SUITE 613 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			IP, SIKYIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/682,305

Applicant(s)

OHNISHI, TSUKASA

Examiner

Sikyin Ip

Art Unit

1742

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See the attached supplemental Final rejection.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☒ Other: Attached Supplement Detailed Action

SIKYIN IP
PRIMARY EXAMINER

SUPPLEMENTAL DETAILED ACTION

This supplemental action is in response to applicants' request filed January 26, 2005. Newly cited reference **JP 11216591** is only applied to new claims 11 and 16.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-31 of copending Application No. 10/666,129. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claimed Sn base lead-free solder compositions are overlapped by the claims of said copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP 55020403 (abstract).

Cited references disclose the features including the claimed Pb-free Sn base solder alloy compositions. Therefore, when prior art compounds essentially "bracketing" the claimed compounds in structural similarity are all known, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly be motivated to make those claimed compounds in searching for new products in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties. In *re Gyurik*, 596 F.2d 1012, 1018, 201 USPQ 552, 557 (CCPA 1979); See In *re May*, 574 F.2d 1082, 1094, 197 USPQ 601, 611 (CCPA 1978) and In

Art Unit: 1742

re Hoch, 57 CCPA 1292, 1296, 428 F.2d 1341, 1344, 166 USPQ 406, 409 (1970).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in a prior art reference because the prior art reference finds that the prior art composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Also see MPEP § 2131.03 and § 2123.

With respect to instant claim 6, JP 55020403 has Ag content 1 wt.% higher than the claimed range. But, a prima facie case of obviousness would exist where the claimed ranges and prior art do not overlap but are close enough that one ordinary skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties, In re Titanium Metals Corporation of America v. Banner, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ 2d 1934, In re Hoch, 428 F.2d 1341, 166 USPQ 406 (CCPA 1970), and In re Payne 606 F.2d 303, 203 USPQ 245 (CCPA 1979). To overcome the prima facie case, an applicant must show that there are substantial, actual differences between the properties of the claimed compound and the prior art compound. Hoch, 428 F.2d 1343-44, 166 USPQ 406 at 409.

Claims 7, 9-10, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over references as applied to claims above, and further in view of acknowledged prior art admission in instant specification "Description of the Related Art".

The cited Japanese references disclose the features substantially as claimed as set forth in the rejection above except for the use as set forth in instant claims 7 and 9-10. However, acknowledged prior art admission from page 1 to first paragraph of page 5 of instant specification discloses limitations set forth in instant claims are known to be

solder with solder composition similar to cited references in the same field of endeavor or the analogous metallurgical art. Accordingly, it would have been prima facie obvious for an ordinary skill artisan motivated by a reasonable expectation of success to replace the solder of acknowledged prior art with solders from cited references in order to obtain all of the known benefits of good appearance and high corrosion resistance. It has been held a use of new material (here old solders) in old patented process is not invention since process is merely being used with analogous material in same art for which process was developed, *In re LaVerne, et al.*, 108 USPQ 335.

Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over JP 11216591 (abstract [54]).

JP 11-216591 in abstract discloses the features including the claimed Sn based solder. With respect to instant claim 16, that the combination of Cu, Co and Sn elements are disclosed in Table 1, sample 26, [0027]. In the absence of unexpected results, selecting composition within known ranges is contemplated within ambit of ordinary skill artisan. Therefore, when prior art compounds essentially "bracketing" the claimed compounds in structural similarity are all known, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly be motivated to make those claimed compounds in searching for new products in the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties. *In re Gyurik*, 596 F.2d 1012, 1018, 201 USPQ 552, 557 (CCPA 1979); See *In re May*, 574 F.2d 1082, 1094, 197 USPQ 601, 611 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Hoch*, 57 CCPA 1292, 1296, 428 F.2d 1341, 1344, 166 USPQ 406, 409 (1970). As stated in *In re Peterson*, 315 F.3d 1325, 1329-30, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2003), that "A

Art Unit: 1742

prima facie case of obviousness typically exists when the ranges of a claimed composition overlap the ranges disclosed in the prior art". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in a prior art reference because the prior art reference finds that the prior art composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. As stated in *In re Peterson*, 65 USPQ2d 1379, 1382 (CAFC 2003), that "A prima facie case of obviousness typically exists when the ranges of a claimed composition overlap the ranges disclosed in the prior art." Also see MPEP § 2131.03 and § 2123. The recited liquidus temperature is material property, which would have been inherently possessed by the material of cited reference.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 1, 2004 and declaration filed December 1, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

JP 2001-205476 is withdrawn in view of declaration filed by applicants on December 1, 2004.

Applicant's argument with respect to obviousness-type double patenting in page 5 of instant remarks is noted. But, the instant claimed solder composition includes the solder composition of co-pending application (10/666,129).

Applicant's argument in page 11 of instant remarks is noted. But, it is found inconsistent with instant transitional expression "comprising" in claim 1 which is inclusive and fails to exclude unrecited ingredients even in major amounts. See Ex

parte Davis et al. (POBA 1948) 80 USPQ 448 and In re Bertsch 132 F2d 1014, 56 USPQ 379 (CCPA 1942). With respect to the transitional expression "consists essentially of" in new added claim 11, for example, applicant fails to show the basic and novel characteristic of his/her composition - i.e. a showing that the introduction of these components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's composition. In re De Lajarte, 337 F 2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964) and Ex parte Davis, et al., 80 USPQ 448, 450 (PTO Bd. App. 1948).

Applicant's argument in paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 of instant remarks is noted. But, if strength is not required, then Ag could be lower as instantly claimed.

Applicant's argument in paragraph bridging pages 14-15 of instant remarks is noted. But, instant transitional expressions do not exclude Au.

Applicant's argument in pages 15-16 of instant remarks is noted. But, Co is taught in cited references.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1742

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).

All recited limitations in the instant claims have been met by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (571) 272-1241. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (571)-272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SIKYIN IP
PRIMARY EXAMINER